

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 9 and 30 have been amended (strikeouts and/or brackets indicating deleted text and underlining indicating added text). No new matter has been added. Claims 9, 10, 30, 31, and 45 to 84 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 45 to 84 have been withdrawn from consideration. Applicants respectfully reserve all rights to resubmit those claims to the Patent Office, e.g., in a continuation/divisional application filing. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

II. Objection to the Specification Under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a)

The amendment to the Specification has been objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a) as assertedly introducing new matter. Applicants traverse this assertion.

The Office Action asserts that the Specification as originally filed does not support the features of a “database stored in a memory.” It is respectfully submitted that support for these features may be found in the Specification, e.g., at paragraph 26 as originally filed, which discloses hierarchically structured documents stored in a server, and in canceled claim 12, which recited “a database configured to store a first hierarchical data file,” as originally filed. Further, it is noted that the originally filed claims themselves are also part of the specification. *See* MPEP § 2163(I)(A). Accordingly, the features of a database stored in a memory is supported by the Specification and claims as filed, and Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the Specification has been overcome.

III. Objection to Claim 30

Claim 30 was objected to for having a typographical error of “fir st.” Applicants thank the Examiner for noting the inadvertent typographical error, and have amended herein without prejudice claim 30 to recite “first.” Accordingly, claim 30 properly recites “first” and is believed allowable; and Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to claim 30 has been overcome.

IV. Rejection of Claims 30 and 31 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶

Claims 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as assertedly indefinite.

Specifically, claims 30 and 31 were rejected for an asserted insufficient antecedent basis for the feature “converting the data.” While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the merits of this rejection; to facilitate matters, claim 30 has been amended herein without prejudice to recite “the conversion of the data...”. No new matter has been added. Claim 31 depends from claim 30. Accordingly, Applicants believe that the now-amended claim 30, and dependent claim 31, are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the present rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 is therefore respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 9 and 10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as assertedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter indefinite.

The Office Action asserts that claims 9 and 10 “appear to be claiming ‘software systems’ i.e. systems without hardware indication, which is a computer program per se.” Final Office Action, page 6. However, claim 9 recites a processor, which is a hardware component. Further, claim 9 has been amended herein without prejudice to recite an additional hardware component, i.e., “a memory configured to store a customizing table.” Claim 10 depends from claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants believe that amended claim 9 and claim 10 are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the present rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

VI. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter contained in claims 9, 10, 30, and 31.

In this regard, the Examiner will note that each of claims 9 (from which claim 10 depends) and 30 (from which claim 31 depends), has been amended herein without prejudice to overcome the present objections and rejections, as explained above.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 9, 10, 30, and 31 are in condition for immediate allowance.

U.S. Pat. Appl. Ser. No. 10/789,721
Attorney Docket No. 11884/411001
Reply to Final Office Action of May 7, 2007

VII. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP



Dated: July 31, 2007

By: _____
Aaron Grunberger
Reg. No. 59,210

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 23838